

PATENT
450101-4689REMARKS

The Office Action in the above-identified application has been carefully considered and this amendment has been presented to place this application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, reexamination and reconsideration of this application are respectfully requested.

Claims 23-143 are in the present application. It is submitted that these claims were patentably distinct over the prior art cited by the Examiner, and that these claims were in full compliance with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112. The changes to the claims, as presented herein, are not made for the purpose of patentability within the meaning of 35 U.S.C. sections 101, 102, 103 or 112. Rather, these changes are made simply for clarification and to round out the scope of protection to which Applicants are entitled.

Claims 23, 31, 77, 129, and 136 were objected to because of various typographical informalities. These claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's comments. Hence, Applicants believe these objections have been overcome.

Claims 23-143 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for containing numerous unclear recitations and awkward wording. In response, Applicants have amended the claims to address each of the Examiner's comments on pages 3-15 of the Office Action. Hence, Applicants believe these rejections have been overcome.

Claims 23-25, 28, 29, 31-33, 36, 37, 57, 58, 60-63, 65, 66, 68-71, 73, 74, 76-79, 81-86, 89-93, 96, and 119-143 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Raz et al.

PATENT
450101-4689

(U.S. Patent 5,913,227). Claims 59 and 67 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz. Claims 26, 27, 34, 35, 39-43, 45-48, and 51-54 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz in view of Davison (U.S. Patent 6,430,592). Claims 30, 38, 64, 72, 87, 88, 94, and 95 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz in view of Voeten et al. (U.S. Patent 5,528,282). Claims 44, 50, and 56 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz in view of Davison and Voeten. Claims 49 and 55 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz in view of Davison and Dewey et al. (U.S. Patent 5,301,324). Claims 75 and 80 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz in view of Arsenault et al. (U.S. Patent 6,278,717). Claims 97, 98, 102-104, and 108-111 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz in view of Dixon et al. (U.S. Patent 5,935,206). Claims 99-101 and 105-107 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Raz in view of Dixon and Dewey. However, in the present invention, "the upper control terminal means are connected through a network to controllers which are directly connected to said plurality of control targets." (Claim 23, all independent claims contain similar limitations) As shown in Figure 1, the present invention is directed to a transmission broadcast system where application computers (upper control terminals 11-13) are connected through a local area network 15 to a hierarchy of controllers which manage and control through direct connections the processing sections (control targets) of several AV servers 30, 40. The Examiner contends the features of the present invention are met by various combinations of Raz, Voeten, Davison, Dixon, Dewey, and Arsenault. Applicants respectfully assert that none of the cited reference discloses the physical structure of the broadcast system shown in Figure 1 and recited in the present claims. Therefore, for at least this reason, Raz, Voeten, Davison, Dixon, Dewey, and

PATENT
450101-4689

Arsenault fail to anticipate or obviate the present invention and the rejected claims should now be allowed.

In view of the foregoing amendment and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the application as now presented is in condition for allowance. Early and favorable reconsideration of the application are respectfully requested.

No additional fees are deemed to be required for the filing of this amendment, but if such are, the Examiner is hereby authorized to charge any insufficient fees or credit any overpayment associated with the above-identified application to Deposit Account No. 50-0320.

If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions, he/she is invited to call the undersigned at the telephone number provided below. The Examiner's consideration of this matter is gratefully acknowledged.

Respectfully submitted,
FROMMER LAWRENCE & HAUG LLP

By: 

Darren M. Simon
Reg. No. 47,946
(212) 588-0800